

## SHELTER OPTIONS FOR RAKHINE STATE

2015 - 2016

### BACKGROUND

2013 required a mass temporary shelter construction to avert a humanitarian crisis following two spates of violence in 2012 that destroyed people's homes and displaced 140,000 persons. 2,898 eight family unit temporary structures were built. Two years on, approximately 84 per cent of all IDPs *still* reside within these temporary shelters in 61 different sites in central and northern Rakhine State. Many shelters were built within planned camps but others located in their place/village of origin.

This paper follows the Shelter Cluster's *Concept Note Shelter Repair, Maintenance & Improvements Partnership*, see Annex I. This *Concept Note* laid out a series of steps required; consultation, an overall understanding of the needs and then project formulation. As part of ongoing extensive consultations with the Rakhine State Government this paper and annexes outlines the needs and how they can be addressed. The key period to address the needs is during the dry season, October to April. This highlights what should be the shelter priorities for the Rakhine State Government (RSG), supported by the Shelter Cluster, for the next two dry seasons.<sup>1</sup>

### CONTEXT

When considering shelter options, it is vital to make the distinction between those located in their place/village of origin versus those within planned camps. The emphasis should be on providing a shelter response beyond temporary collective units. Particularly for those located in or near their place of origin the most appropriate and cost efficient solution, would be individual shelter units. For many IDPs in the camps, next steps will likely take longer so for this caseload the more likely response will require maintenance, repair and improvements to their temporary shelters. The challenge is to what degree conditions in temporary shelters are permitted to deteriorate at the expense of pursuing other responses whose success may hinge on unpredictable variables, with the best case scenario being that the authorities successfully demonstrate and promote individual shelter units are *more* suited to the needs and *more* cost effective.

### WATER & SANITATION

When considering the provision of shelter, it is equally important to consider sanitation infrastructure and safe water access. The result is dignified accommodation and a healthy environment.

For camps, communities can be more engaged in the response. Upgrading of WASH infrastructure should deliver functionality through IDP maintenance. Some specific locations, where communities suffer from water shortages during the dry season, still require emergency water supply. Options here could include technical alternatives or relocation to more suitable sites.

For individuals already in their village of origin and water and sanitation already provided, some upgrading to what has been achieved in previous years may be needed. For communities returning to their village of origin, the individual location or habitat should be seen as a package, considering

---

<sup>1</sup> The dry season constitutes October to April, wet season May to September. While construction can occur in the wet season, although depending on the site it can come with significant challenges, the critical issue is that *seasoned* wood cannot be bought in the wet season. At a minimum for construction to occur, funds must be made available to purchase seasoned wood by April. If not, no construction will occur until the following dry season, October.

shelter, water and sanitation. Most of all, it is crucial that, prior to construction, site evaluations be carried out in regards of shelter, sanitation and water, in order to ensure appropriate infrastructure to support the safety of beneficiaries *and* the environment.

## REPAIR & MAINTENANCE OF TEMPORARY SHELTERS

As Shelter Cluster partners fully adhered to the *temporary* nature of the shelters in 2013, conditions are such that the majority of shelters require some form of repair and maintenance. Due to the uniformity of the design the approach should be prescriptive; replace half of the roofing sheets plus everything except the skeletal frame. This would mean new flooring, floor structure and bamboo matt walling. Major structural concerns can be addressed on a case by case basis. These activities would be classified as *repair* and *maintenance*. If temporary shelters are to last an additional two years, a package of approximately \$750 per eight-unit temporary shelter is recommended. For more details on proposed repair and maintenance activities see Annex II, *Repair, Maintenance and Upgrading of Temporary Shelters*.

Note that \$750 is based on direct costs. Direct costs do *not* include support costs or overheads if the work is done by an implementing partner. Depending on the partner this can increase costs by up to 40 per cent. All costs stated in this paper are based on direct costs estimates.

## UPGRADING OF TEMPORARY SHELTERS

Upgrading of temporary shelters would be in addition to repair and maintenance activities. This could address ventilation issues, fire and smoke mitigation and improved privacy and lighting. These activities must include extensive community consultations IDP groups, women, men, elderly, youth and children. Costs for improvements would be approximately an additional \$550 per eight-unit temporary shelter. Combined the total direct cost per eight-unit temporary building for repair, maintenance and improvements would be \$1,300.

When minimum standards for temporary shelters were being developed, Shelter Cluster partners reduced the number of units per shelter from ten to eight, increasing the total floor area per unit by 25% to 15ft x 11.25ft (169 sqft).<sup>2</sup> Apart from combining temporary shelter units, it is not possible to increase floor space within shelters. To maintain fire safety standards, it is imperative the fire breaks between shelters are maintained at 15ft between shelters and 25ft between each cluster of five shelters.<sup>3</sup> Discussions at Rakhine State Shelter Cluster meetings reveal that the Rakhine State Government wish to depopulate the IDP camps, returning IDPs that arrived in the second wave of violence in October 2012, back to their townships of origin plus the so-called 'economic IDP' households, to their villages or origin in nearby Sittwe Township. Were this to happen, more floor space for each IDP family could be addressed. For more details on proposed upgrading activities see Annex II, *Repair, Maintenance and Upgrading of Temporary Shelters*.

## INDIVIDUAL SHELTER OPTIONS

Individual shelter options, for those located in or near their place of origin, otherwise termed relocated IDPs, are likely to be one of three possibilities. Either an elevated or short-legged individual

---

<sup>2</sup> However, 160 temporary shelters still remain in Say Tha Mar Gyi camp (140 shelters) and Baw Du Par 2 (20 shelters). Improvements should provide the opportunity to replace these remaining 160 shelters with 200 temporary 8-unit shelters.

<sup>3</sup> It is not uncommon to observe extension of the veranda area and the construction of temporary bathing facilities in the fire breaks between temporary shelters. Whilst Shelter Cluster partners can advise against such practices, responsibility for maintaining fire safety standards rests with the RSG supported by CCCM agencies.

shelter or a package of construction materials and labour costs; all three options must adhere to minimum standards as agreed by the Shelter Cluster with the Rakhine State Government:

Option 1: Elevated individual house	\$5,000/household
Option 2: Short-legged individual house	\$4,000/household
Option 3: Package of construction materials and labour costs	\$1,800/household

While Options 1 and 2 would use a contractor to build, option 3 would involve the provision of a materials package plus labour costs, but construction would be managed directly by the recipient. Option 3 takes into account lessons learned from previous shelter responses in Myanmar, most recently in southern Rakhine State, Thandwe Township. 55 households received a materials package after the inter-communal violence of October 2013. For more details on options 1, 2 and 3 see Annexes III and IV.

## PRIORITIES & COSTINGS

### Repair, Maintenance & Upgrading of Temporary Shelters

In 2014, 1,183 temporary shelters were repaired by humanitarian actors, mostly in rural areas of Sittwe Township, 42 per cent of all temporary shelters. All work was done by humanitarian actors, partners of the Shelter Cluster. Noting the Rakhine State Government's stated wish to improve the shelter conditions for all IDPs, the Shelter Cluster would suggest a phased approach based on three priority categories.

1<sup>st</sup> Priority: Temporary shelters constructed by the Rakhine State Government in 2013

2<sup>nd</sup> Priority: Temporary shelters constructed by partners of Shelter Cluster not yet repaired in 2014

3<sup>rd</sup> Priority: Temporary shelters repaired in 2014

The repair and maintenance needs of shelters in the first and second priority groups require attention *before* the 2015 rainy season, May *this* year. Shelters repaired in 2014 should be a priority in the next dry season, October 2015 to April 2016. As the below table illustrates, direct costs to address the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> priorities for maintenance and repair would cost \$589,500. This would address 786 eight-unit structures, almost 6,300 HH, 31,500 individuals.

Looking ahead to the next dry season, October 2015 – April 2016, the repair, maintenance *and* upgrading direct costs for those still likely to remain in temporary shelters would be \$2,360,800. This would address 1,816 eight-unit structures, over 14,500 HH, 72,500 individuals.

### Individual Shelter Options

While individual elevated or short-legged housing can be provided in some areas, in reality at the current time this is only a comparatively minor number of sites and HH. Scope for significant quantities of individual shelter options should focus on the package of construction materials and labour costs.

As Annex V illustrates, for this dry season individual shelter options should be prioritised for two sites in Pauktaw Township and three sites in Rathedaung Township. The direct cost would be \$2,954,850. It would address the needs of 1,700 HH, over 8,600 individuals. Rationale for prioritising these locations is primarily based on humanitarian need. The two sites in Pauktaw are no longer sustainable. The isolation, terrain and soil conditions have resulted in collapsing structures.<sup>4</sup> Recent

---

<sup>4</sup> For photos of collapsing temporary shelters see Annex I (page 4).

consultations with the Rakhine State Government indicate that returning to their village of origin is now feasible.

For the following dry season, 24 different sites are proposed for similar individual shelter options across seven different townships. Large proportions of IDPs have returned to their original household plots. The response would seek to build-upon the resilience they have shown by constructing unaided makeshift or temporary shelter.

## IMPLEMENTATION

During the construction of 2,898 temporary shelters in 2013, the Shelter Cluster had 11 implementing partners. The Rakhine State Government (RSG) funded and constructed 45 per cent of all shelters. UNHCR and its partner, the Danish Refugee Council (DRC), constructed 30 per cent. The remaining 25 per cent were constructed by eight other partners.

The 2014 shelter strategy focused on ‘essential’ maintenance and ‘minor’ repairs of temporary shelters. Project implementation was largely through camp management agencies (CMAs); DRC and Lutheran World Federation (LWF). The Rakhine State Government was not allocated funding for shelter activities in 2014 and did not meet their Cluster responsibility to implement maintenance and repair programs across five townships.<sup>5</sup>

Currently the only active partners in the sector are UNHCR, supported in maintenance and repair by CMAs DRC and LWF. If *all* the outlined shelter opportunities arise in 2015, Shelter Cluster UN/INGO partners do not have the capacity to implement. The most appropriate partner for a timely response would be the Rakhine State Government.<sup>6</sup> If they lead the response, mobilizing their huge capacity and critically ensure operational space for the needs to be addressed, as they did in 2013, the Shelter Cluster is confident that remaining gaps could be addressed. This could include advocating for funds to be channeled directly to the Rakhine State Government.

## Summary Table

Type of IDP Location	2014-15 Dry Season				2015-16 Dry Season			
	Maintenance & Repair		Individual Shelter Materials Package		Maintenance, Repair & Upgrade		Individual Shelter Materials Package	
	Shelters	Cost	HH	Cost	Shelters	Cost	HH	Cost
Near Village of Origin	176	\$ 32,000	1,592	\$ 2,865,600				
In Village of Origin	251	\$188,250	119	\$ 89,250			2,445	\$ 4,401,000
Relocated to IDP Camps	359	\$ 69,250			1,816	\$ 2,360,800	393	\$ 1,094,600
	<b>786</b>	<b>\$ 589,500</b>	<b>1,711</b>	<b>\$ 2,954,850</b>	<b>1,816</b>	<b>\$ 2,360,800</b>	<b>2,838</b>	<b>\$ 5,495,600</b>
	<b>\$3,544,350</b>				<b>\$7,856,400</b>			
	<b>\$11,400,750</b>							

<sup>5</sup> These five townships were Rathedaung, Kyawtaw, Minbya, Kyaukphyu and Ramree.

<sup>6</sup> In 2013, the RSG demonstrated their exemplary efficiency by constructing 991 temporary 8-unit shelters across five townships in less than three months; a clear demonstration of technical and logistical capacity to deliver at massive scale, rapidly.

Shelter Activity	Units	Cost
Maintenance & Repair (M/R) of Shelters	786 temporary shelters	\$ 589,500
M/R and UPGRADE of Shelters	1,816 temporary shelters	\$ 2,360,800
Individual Shelter Solutions	4,549 materials packages	\$ 8,450,450

17/3/2015